

UTILITY PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Alexander S. KOZLOV Group Art Unit: 1753
Serial No.: 10/753,675 Examiner: H. D. Wilkins III
Filed: January 7, 2004 Confirmation No.: 1132
For: PLATINUM ALUMINIDE COATING AND METHOD THEREOF
Docket No.: H0005756
Customer No.: 000128

STATEMENT

Office of Petitions
EXAMINER Paul SHANOSKI
Washington, D.C. 22031

Commissioner:

The undersigned received a telephone call on June 12, 2009 from Examiner Paul Shanoski regarding an alleged inconsistency of Attorney Docket Numbers. The Examiner noted that he was confused because Attorney Docket Number H0005756-1060 on the Declaration filed on January 7, 2004 is not identical to Attorney Docket Number H0005756 on the Declaration signed by Svetlana Kozlova, legal representative of deceased inventor Alexander Kozlov filed on April 3, 2009. Examiner Shanoski stated that he would not accept the April 3, 2009 Declaration unless a Statement was filed through the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") Electronic Filing System by close of business June 15, 2009 stating that the two docket numbers refer to the same case. Examiner Shanoski also requested an explanation as to why the two docket numbers are not identical.

This statement is being submitted to confirm that H0005756-1060 and H0005756 refer to the same application. The two numbers are not identical because some time between 2004 and 2009, the internal numbering system for tracking applications assigned to assignee Honeywell International Inc. changed and thus, code "H0005756-1060" changed to "H0005756". Both H0005756-1060 and H0005756 refer to application serial number 10/753,675.

The Examiner is also reminded that the Attorney Docket Number is not a requirement of a valid Oath or Declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.63, nor is an attorney docket number required by any statute or rule for acceptance of any paper submitted to the USPTO. It is for the convenience of an applicant's representative only, and any changes thereto during prosecution of an application are solely at applicant's or applicant's representative's prerogative. Hence, although the explanation is provided herein to move prosecution along, it is submitted that the examiner's requirement that applicants provide this explanation was wholly specious and erroneous.

Favorable consideration of the petition submitted on April 3, 2009 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: June 15, 2009

By: /CINDY H. KWACALA/
Cindy H. Kwacala
Reg. No. 47,667